

In re LIN ET AL., Application No. 10/733,016
Amendment A

REMARKS

The Office action dated April 7, 2006, and the references cited have been fully considered. Please enter the following amendments, and consider the following remarks. Reconsideration and/or further prosecution of the application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added herein.

First, Applicants appreciate the examination of the application. However, Applicants request that the Information Disclosure Statement and its reference properly filed on November 17, 2005, be duly considered and an initialed, signed and dated copy of the corresponding 1449 be returned to Applicants.

Next, all claims stand rejected as being anticipated by Butehorn et al., US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0132451 A1, which is directed to distributing routing information among different devices in a network. Applicants believe the claims are directed to distributing routing information in a single device (i.e., the clients are within the device) - such as described throughout the specification, including, for example, page 10, line 8 (routing information is distributed within a router or other device). Rather than arguing that the properly construed claims are limited to such and as the scope of the claims are not changed, Applicants have specifically amended each of the independent claims to affirmatively recite that the clients are within the respective device, with support provided as discussed *supra*. As Butehorn et al. neither teaches nor suggests the distribution of routing information in a router or other apparatus as recited in any of the claims, all claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Note, Applicants have also taken this opportunity to update the preamble of the Beauregard claims (17, 20, 21) to correspond to the claim draftsman's currently preferred format. Support is provided in the original application, such as by, but not limited to FIGs. 2, 3, and 4A-C and their corresponding discussion in the originally filed specification. No new matter is added.

For at least these reasons, all claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Additionally, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of all claims as the Office action fails to specifically provide teachings for each and every limitation. For example, the

In re LIN ET AL., Application No. 10/733,016
Amendment A

claims refer to "route updates" and "types of route changes" (e.g., as listed on page 17, lines 11-14 of the original specification: notify on change in route, notify on change or reachability information, notify on change of nexthop address or interface, notify on change of hop distance, etc.) where the Office action refers to "routing information" of Butehorn et al. Applicants make a demand for evidence that Butehorn et al. teaches that its routing information includes both "route updates" and "types of route changes". Additionally, for example, the notification of the client is triggered *in response to* the route update matching the registered address and routing attribute (as recited in corresponding language in the independent claims); however, the Office cites the external trigger of paragraph 134 which neither teaches nor suggests such a determination ("in response to") is made. Finally, the rejections must cohere and comply with the antecedent basis presented in each claim. The Office rejects the claims by selecting diverse statements in the references and therefore they do not refer to the same data as would be required for a proper rejection. These comments apply to all the claims.


For at least the reason that each claim affirmatively recites that the routing information is distributed within a single router or other apparatus, all claims are believed to be allowable as this is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record.

In re LIN ET AL., Application No. 10/733,016
Amendment A

In view of the above remarks and for at least the reasons presented herein, all pending claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Office is respectfully requested to issue a timely Notice of allowance in this case. If, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Applicant believes a two-month extension of time is required, and hereby petitions any extension of time required and has included herewith a credit card payment form (PTO-2038) for payment of the extension fee, and Applicant's representative hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge/credit any additional associated fees to Deposit Account No. 501430.

Date: September 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams
By  9/7/2006
Kirk D. Williams, Reg. No. 42,229
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
CUSTOMER NUMBER 26327
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams
1234 S. OGDEN ST., Denver, CO 80210
303-282-0151 (telephone), 303-778-0748 (facsimile)